

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1957

JOHN PAUL TURNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BILL CLINTON, President; GEORGE ALLEN,
Governor,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-1959

JOHN PAUL TURNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DAVID S. KUYKENDALL, VDOC, District 12 - P. O.
Box 238, Staunton, Virginia 24402-0238,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 99-1960

JOHN PAUL TURNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DAVID S. KUYKENDALL,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 99-1962

JOHN PAUL TURNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

A. LEE ERVIN,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 99-1963

JOHN PAUL TURNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

AUGUSTA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; AUGUSTA
GENERAL DISTRICT COURT; AUGUSTA COUNTY CIRCUIT
COURT; COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEYS OFFICE; VIR-
GINIA STATE POLICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Samuel G. Wilson, Chief District
Judge. (CA-95-1114, CA-96-131-R, CA-96-409-R, CA-95-1026-R, CA-95-
946-R)

Submitted: September 30, 1999

Decided: October 6, 1999

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Paul Turner, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

John Paul Turner appeals the district court's orders denying Turner's motions to reopen certain cases that were previously dismissed. We have reviewed the records and the district court's orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Turner's motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeals on the reasoning of the district court. See Turner v. Clinton, No. CA-95-1114; Turner v. Kuykendall, No. CA-96-131-R; Turner v. Kuykendall, No. CA-96-409-R; Turner v. Ervin, No. CA-95-1026-R; Turner v. Augusta County Sheriff's Dep't, No. CA-95-946-R (W.D. Va. June 10 & 11, 1999). The motions for appointment of counsel and for consolidation of all pending cases are denied. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED